

Texas (Mr. COMBEST) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1212, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1212, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### AFFIRMING THE CONGRESS' OPPOSITION TO ALL FORMS OF RACISM AND BIGOTRY

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 121) affirming the Congress' opposition to all forms of racism and bigotry.

The Clerk read as follows:

##### H. RES. 121

Whereas the United States of America has been enriched and strengthened by the diversity and mutual respect of its people;

Whereas the injustices and inequities of the past continue to demand our forceful commitment, both as individuals and as an institution, to equal justice under law and full opportunity for every American;

Whereas a racist attack upon any group of Americans is an affront to every one who cherishes the promise of America and the values that sustain our democracy; and

Whereas every Member of Congress has a responsibility to foster the best traditions and highest values of this nation: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) insists that no individual's rights are negotiable or open to compromise; and

(2) reaffirms the determination of all its Members to oppose any individuals or organizations which seek to divide Americans on the grounds of race, religion, or ethnic origin; and

(3) denounces all those who practice or promote racism, anti-Semitism, ethnic prejudice, or religious intolerance; and

(4) calls upon all Americans of good will to reject the forces of hatred and bigotry wherever and in whatever form they may be found.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS).

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.

Res. 121, the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important matter before us. I want to commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER) for causing this embarrassing substitute to be brought to bear. The scheduling and the substance of this resolution is an utter affront to all believers of civil rights and regular order in the House of Representatives. I appeal to every Member to vote against the underhanded processes involved in bringing H. Res. 121 to the floor this afternoon.

First, a word about bipartisan cooperation, since we have all come back from Hershey over the weekend. Without the courtesy of a simple phone call from the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), this bill was discharged from the committee with no hearing, no markup; another example of how Committee on the Judiciary Democrats are still being treated unfairly at every turn of the process, not even a single phone call. The leadership continues to mistreat what is almost an equal number of Democrats as Republicans in the House.

Secondly, this bill, I think, is intended to be serious but it is really just a joke. A generalized, amorphous, meaningless resolution is an idea taken from the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER) and is now so watered down as to be insulting.

It is a cover for those Republicans who do not want to condemn the Council of Conservative Citizens because so many Republican leaders have been associated with this racist group. They have cloaked themselves in mainstream conservatism, but it is masking an underlying racist agenda. Its leader is the former Midwest director of the White Citizens Council. Their web site reads like something out of the Third Reich.

What are we doing here today? I urge that the Members vote "no" on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CANADY) will control the 20 minutes on the majority side.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS).

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, hatred expressed through racial, religious or ethnic prejudice is an affront to the institutions of freedom, equal

justice and individual rights that together form the bedrock of the American republic.

We need no reminder that bigotry lives on in America. The heinous murder of James Byrd, Jr., shocked us all with the graphic portrait of racism in its most vile form. So this resolution before us is not meant to be a mere reminder, nor is it meant to single out for condemnation any one organization or individual.

To be so particular would be to commit a crime of omission by giving a pass to other groups that espouse prejudiced, racist views, in effect saying that their bigotry is not so offensive as to be worthy of our condemnation. The Southern Poverty Law Center says that 537 hate groups exist in the United States. We cannot possibly condemn each bigoted organization, person or act individually.

In any event, there is a better course to take. Today we can make one sweeping statement of principle that acknowledges the existence of bigotry, condemns those who promote or practice it, and affirms the rights of individuals of all races, religions and ethnic backgrounds.

Passing this resolution will not reverse the horrible tragedy of James Byrd's death, nor will it directly prevent future tragedies of the same sort. It will not eliminate the more subtle but more common kind of bigotry that rears its ugly head every single day, like when a man gets on a subway, when a man of a certain color gets on a subway car and instinctively sits next to the person of his color instead of a person of another color; or when a Jewish family on the block is not fully accepted by some of their Protestant neighbors; or when a Hispanic kid walks into a store and is watched under a suspicious eye.

Let us also celebrate the great strides we have made as a Nation and as a people in moving toward a more unified America. Let us salute great men and women like Frederick Douglass and Rosa Parks and John Lewis and Abraham Lincoln and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., as well as the millions of others whose names we do not know but whose efforts have torn down many of the walls that far too long divided us.

Every American must keep working toward that goal of a hate-free America. So today, in this Chamber, let us stand and be counted. Today let us condemn all forms of racial, religious and ethnic prejudice.

Some will say this afternoon that because this resolution did not name a certain group, did not specifically name certain groups, that this resolution has no bearing. Why do we make racism and bigotry that small? What happens is that if someone names a certain group? Then someone else will offer a resolution to name another

group, and then somebody will organize another resolution to name another group. What we get, Mr. Speaker, we get a tit for tat, we get an eye for an eye and tooth for a tooth.

Let me remind my colleagues what Dr. King said. He said when we have an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, it leaves America toothless and blind.

Let us carry on the fight for an America where Dr. King's dream can become a reality, an America where freedom rings crisply in the ears of every member of our national family, and an America where equal justice and equal opportunity are no longer mere goals but instead true hallmarks of our Nation's character. Please support this resolution.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my good friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS), who could not join the organization that he is covering up for, the Council of Conservative Citizens, if he applied, that this is not tit for tat.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER), a distinguished attorney and a member of the Committee on the Judiciary who caused the Republicans to bring this forward.

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Speaker, the resolution we are debating today is unfortunately nothing but a sham because it subverts the intent of the 147 Republican and Democratic cosponsors of the Wexler-Clyburn-Forbes resolution.

Our bipartisan resolution, House Resolution 35, was introduced seven weeks ago, and confronts head-on the ghosts of America's past, condemning the racism that has divided us as a Nation and exposing the insidious and hateful agenda of the Council of Conservative Citizens, the CCC.

The Watts resolution was introduced just Thursday. It has, I understand, no cosponsors. It confronts nothing. It was rushed to the floor today without committee consideration. The Watts resolution is designed only to derail our resolution and, if successful, hands the CCC an unconscionable victory.

Revealing the true identity of the Council of Conservative Citizens is the right thing to do. The CCC attempts to mask its hateful ideology by posing as a mainstream conservative organization, but the racist agenda of this group is undeniable. The CCC has directed its hatred towards millions of Americans, African Americans, Hispanic Americans, Jewish Americans, homosexuals, immigrants and virtually all minorities.

□ 1530

Listen, listen to what the leader of the CCC said about his group's strategy. I will replace his use of the N word with the word "blacks."

"The Jews are going to fall from the inside, not from the outside, and the

"blacks" will be a puppet on a string for us. The power is not out there in the gun, it is inside Congress. . . We've got to do it from the inside."

The CCC is a wolf in sheep's clothing, and with racially motivated crimes on the rise, it is imperative that Congress go on record exposing them for the bigots they are. That is why the alternative resolution before us today is empty. It gives lip service to condemning racism, but it does not specifically cite the CCC, nor does it strengthen our civil rights laws. It does nothing real. It offers cover, not content.

In 1994 when this Congress voted overwhelmingly to condemn the racist, anti-Catholic, anti-Semitic speech of Khalid Abdul Muhammad of the Nation of Islam, there was no outcry about singling out one man for criticism. There was no rush to promote a generic statement about all racism, instead of identifying a specific and dangerous speech that had outraged millions of Americans.

So I guess what it all comes down to is that when it is a black person who is a racist it is okay for Congress to condemn him, but when it is a white person or a white group that is racist, then Congress does nothing, and we become, as the chairman, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HENRY HYDE) said in 1994, accessories by silence, by inaction.

I respectfully urge Members to vote no on House Resolution 121. Let us bring House Resolution 35 to the floor for a meaningful vote.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS).

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I would just say to my friend, the gentleman from Florida, that it is an amazing thing to me that over the last 4 years when I have been attacked, when I have had racist comments made about me, my friend from Florida never came to the floor and spoke up.

The gentleman from Michigan, when I have had racist attacks made against me by people in the white community back in Oklahoma, the State Democrat party back in Oklahoma, Slate magazine, which is a national magazine, no one ran to the floor to condemn that.

I think my resolution is much broader. My resolution condemns the New Order Knights of the Ku Klux Klan, the National Alliance, Aryan Nation, the CCC. Anybody that advocates these racist, bigoted, vile views is condemned in my resolution.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I would let my good friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS) know that I did not know he was attacked. If he was attacked in his home area, it was by right-wing zealots that may have been in the Council of Conservative Citizens.

But since the gentleman mentioned the names of these hate groups, why does the gentleman not put them in the resolution? Why do we not just debate them?

The gentleman spoke about no one came to his defense. I would have loved to have come to the defense of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS).

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 121, which was introduced by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS), affirms the opposition of the Congress to all forms of racism and bigotry. The resolution recognizes the grievous harm caused by racism, and emphasizes the responsibility of every Member of Congress to foster the best traditions and highest values of this Nation.

At the heart of the American experience is the ideal of respect for the dignity of the individual set forth in the Declaration of Independence. All men are created equal, and are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights.

This ideal has never been more eloquently expressed than by Dr. Martin Luther King, Junior. According to Dr. King, the image of God "is universally shared in equal portions by all men. There is no graded scale of essential worth. Every human being has etched in his personality the indelible stamp of the Creator. . . The worth of an individual does not lie in the measure of his intellect, his racial origin, or his social position. Human worth lies in relatedness to God. Whenever this is recognized, 'whiteness' and 'blackness' pass away as determinants in a relationship, and son and brother are substituted."

Dr. King explicitly linked this view of man and woman created in the image of God to the philosophical foundation of the United States. This is what Dr. King says about the foundation of America:

"Its pillars were soundly grounded in the insights of our Judeo-Christian heritage: All men are made in the image of God; all men are brothers; all men are created equal; every man is heir to a legacy of dignity and worth; every man has rights that are neither conferred by nor derived from the state, they are God-given."

These fundamental principles are at odds with any theory that distinctive human characteristics and abilities are determined by race. These principles condemn any effort to reduce individual human beings to the status of racial entities.

In this resolution, the House of Representatives recognizes that anyone, or any group, whether they are the Ku Klux Klan, the Aryan Nation, or the Council of Conservative Citizens, which fails to honor and respect these principles has attacked the very foundation of our Republic.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 13 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, as an original author of the Martin Luther King holiday bill, and one who worked and knew Dr. King, I am sure happy to see that at least the other side has been reading about King and have appropriate quotations to bring to this debate, falsely implying that he might not be supporting what we are trying to do.

The gentleman ought to name the organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MICHAEL FORBES), pointing out that he could not get time on the other side.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us belabors the obvious, that Congress is opposed to racism and hatred. The people watching this debate must be scratching their heads thinking, but surely this most American of all American institutions is already against racism and bigotry and the intolerant acts this that seek to divide us as a people.

Certainly an integral part of the charter of this place, it would seem evident, is our basic, unadulterated opposition to racism. So why this effort?

The resolution before us denounces "all those who practice or promote racism, anti-Semitism, ethnic prejudice, or religious intolerance." It is a general statement by Congress against racism and bigotry, where a specific one is not only warranted but demanded.

The need for a swift and sure condemnation of the activities of a specific group, in this case the Council of Conservative Citizens, is necessary because under the cloak of portraying itself as a Main Street grass roots organization dedicated to conservative ideals, the CCC further attempted to legitimize itself by having Members of Congress appear before the group. Where its words and its rhetoric would never render this hate group credible, they sought to have Members of this very institution legitimize their very illegitimate behavior.

It is worth noting that Members have denounced the group's activities. The CCC has been noted as a direct outgrowth of the White Citizens Council of the fifties and sixties, known as the White-Collar Clan. A glance at their web site, as we have heard previously, shows they continue an allegiance to promoting anti-Semitic, racist rhetoric and ideas.

When an organization or a group such as the CCC attempts to misuse the good offices of those who are elected to represent all the people, the Congress does have an obligation, I believe, to take decisive action against such groups.

In 1994, it has been noted that the Congress swiftly dealt with the hate-mongering remarks of Khalid Muhammed when he appeared before Kean College. Three hundred and sixty-one to 34, his bigotry and hatred was denounced on the Floor of this very Chamber.

The matter before us restates an opposition to bigotry and hatred that should be evident. I might point out that later on, this body will also deal with a specific reference to anti-Semitic comments made by the members of the Russian Duma, so we do single out people when we feel they are wrong. Unfortunately, the resolution fails to repudiate an organization that sought legitimacy by involving Members of this great institution.

I would encourage reconsideration and allow House Resolution 35 to repudiate, as we hoped it would.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I would respond to a couple of points made by the gentleman from Michigan.

In quoting Dr. King, I did not mean to imply that he would take one position or another in the controversy between the two sides here today. I simply quoted him for the fundamental proposition concerning the nature of racism and the nature of the political foundations of this country, and I believe that is something that all of us could agree on. I hope that we all would agree on it. I know that the gentleman from Michigan would agree with what Dr. King had to say, though he may disagree with the way it was used.

I would also point out that the gentleman from New York (Mr. FORBES) did not request time from this side, so the statement that the gentleman made that the gentleman from New York was unable to receive time from this side is simply untrue. If the gentleman had requested it, it would have been granted to him. No such request was made.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. CANADY), the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Constitution, on which I am proud to serve, for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time to just maybe sit back, stand back, take a deep breath, and think a little bit about the many things that we have in common on both sides of the aisle, and practice what is far too frequently lacking in this Chamber and in the surrounding hallways, and that is a little bit of consistency.

Mr. Speaker, the Minority Leader, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) spoke on at least two occasions to a predecessor group of the CCC, associated therewith. He has since con-

demned groups such as the CCC, as I have and as I do. Yet, in those who rail against anybody who might have inadvertently spoken to this group, strangely silent is any criticism remotely similar to the criticism leveled at others if it just happens to be somebody on their side of the aisle.

So I would urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to practice a little consistency, both with regard to those people who might have spoken to such groups that we all have and always will condemn, as well as a little consistency with regard to those groups that we do condemn, such as the CCC.

Arguing that one person should be treated differently because of the color of their skin, the church in which they worship, the country of their birth, it always has been, on this side of the aisle and on that side of the aisle, and always will be wrong.

Our country fought a great Civil War, as a matter of fact, over such principles. Yet we still remain troubled today by a small number of Americans who persist in arguing against a color-blind society. Yes, those associated with and under the label of the CCC do that. We condemn them. I condemn them. I join my colleague from Florida in condemning them and my colleague from Michigan in condemning them.

I would certainly hope that they would believe in the sincerity of these remarks delivered in these hallowed halls by myself, the same as I have done in writing, just the same as they believe it when one of their colleagues condemns a group they might have spoken with, and found out later that they harbor views that are abhorrent to the minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), just as they are abhorrent to me.

□ 1545

So let us step back, practice a little bit of consistency, a little bit of fairness, and recognize that we have a great deal in common in supporting this resolution today.

Maybe it does not go as far as some Members would like, but I do think there is great merit in passing a resolution worded as the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS) has that goes far beyond simply condemning a specific group and being silent on other groups.

These matters are too important. We should support this. Condemn all racist views on whichever side of the political spectrum and put this matter to rest right now once and for all.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this resolution, not because of what it says, but because of what it fails to say and because of the procedure which brings this resolution to the floor and what that procedure says to all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard Dr. King quoted here pretty often today. I would like to share with my colleagues another quote from Dr. King. Dr. King wrote, as he sat in the Birmingham city jail, that "we are going to be made to repent in this generation, not just for the vitriolic words and deeds of bad people, but for the appalling silence of good people."

I think that this resolution is silent over what we are here to denounce today. It is fine for us to reaffirm the obvious, but I think that the Congress must now condemn the kind of rhetoric, the kind of ideas, the kinds of thoughts that are being enunciated by the Council of Conservative Citizens.

The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS) has asked, why have we not defended him against certain similar instances. The fact of the matter is I do not remember the gentleman from Oklahoma defending me when the Council of Conservative Citizens attacked me in my last two campaigns. Probably he did not know I was attacked. Of course we did not know he was attacked either.

The fact is, though, we are here with 150 cosponsors with a resolution that we have asked to be brought to this floor to give all of us an opportunity to express our views on this group of people. We have not been granted that opportunity. I do not see where this resolution in any way takes away from what we are attempting to do.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe that we should be today condemning specific expressions by a specific group, the Council of Conservative Citizens. I do not think that we can afford to ignore this kind of vile rhetoric in the climate in which we live, a climate of racial profiling, a climate of ethnic bashing, a climate of religious intolerance. It is time for us to speak up and stand up for those people that we are here to represent.

Mr. Speaker, I remember the words of Martin Niemöller of Germany who once wrote: In Germany, first they came for the Jews, and I did not speak up because I was not Jewish. Then they came for the Catholics. I did not speak up, because I was Protestant. Then they came for the trade unionists and the industrialists, and I did not speak up because I was not a member of either group. Finally, they came for me. And by that time, there was no one left to speak up.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PICKERING).

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 121, con-

demning hatred and bigotry in all forms. But I rise today with a certain amount of sadness about the nature of this debate. If my colleagues do not mind, I would like to talk in a personal way about my family and life experience as it comes to this issue and what my hope is for my service and my contribution to this body.

In 1963, the day I was born, my father was elected as county attorney in Jones County, Mississippi, one of the most violent and turbulent places in the country during the civil rights initiative. During that period of time, he testified against the Imperial Wizard of the KKK, Sam Bowers.

In 1968, because of his stand against the Klan and against the violence, and because he testified against Sam Bowers, he lost his next election. But I can tell my colleagues that, as his son, I am very proud of what he did during that time. He left me a rich legacy, an example of courage. I hope I can do the same for my five boys.

In 1969, my first grade class was the first to be integrated in Mississippi. I want to be part of a new generation that brings reconciliation among our races.

This debate today, I am afraid, is not about reconciliation, and it is not about unity. It is about dividing. It is about personal destruction. It is about partisan advantage.

I hope we can all step back and look not only at the objective of racial reconciliation and condemning all bigotry and all hatred, but to see it this way, that this House, that this body can come together in everything we do with a true goal, a true purpose of reconciliation, of unity. Then this country and this House will be a better place because of it.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I was so moved by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PICKERING). Could the gentleman from Mississippi explain how racial conciliation can come from the Council of Conservative Citizens, a racist group?

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BARRETT).

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we all know why we are here. We are here because of the Council of Conservative Citizens, a racist group. This resolution does not speak to that. It is silent. By its silence, it speaks volumes. It speaks volumes of this institution's refusal to confront racism.

The reason this institution refuses to confront racism is because it is uncomfortable for some Members here, and that is just too bad because, until we confront racism, it is going to continue. If we simply excuse it, whitewash it, apologize for it or ignore it, it is going to continue.

There is nothing wrong with the words in this resolution. They simply

do not confront the real problem. I think it is ironic that on the same day that we have a resolution, in essence, condemning a member of the Duma for antisemitic comments that we do not do the same thing to confront racism in our own country. We are ready to condemn it in Russia, but we are not ready to condemn it here; and that is the tragedy of what we are doing today.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS).

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I would just say to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BARRETT) that I have felt racism. It is not fun. It is very uncomfortable.

So I would just say to the gentleman from Wisconsin, I believe I know his heart on this issue and I know that his motives are true or that they are in the right place, but we are talking about naming names. I would like for the gentleman from Wisconsin to name names as to who is uncomfortable with stating that racism is wrong.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to offer my support to H. Res. 121 denouncing all individuals and all organizations that would seek to perpetuate hate against any groups or individuals.

We are all aware that there has been a dramatic increase in the number of hate crimes perpetrated against minorities in the United States. Too often we hear in the news of acts of violence perpetrated against groups or individuals simply because of their race or ethnicity.

The recent incident in Jasper, Texas, resulting in the tragic death of James Byrd, remains a strong reminder that Congress needs to address these kind of crimes to ensure that those who commit them will be punished accordingly.

Many of us in the Congress who have witnessed such acts firsthand of bigotry, racism, and prejudice are deeply committed to doing all we can and all that is possible to diminish these acts committed by people who utilize prejudice to spread an agenda of hate among others simply because of differences of race, color, or creed that may exist between them.

The passage of this measure, H.R. 121, affirming the opposition of Congress to all forms of racism and bigotry, I think is an important first step toward recognizing such crimes as well as ensuring that at long last we may see the beginnings to an end of such unjust acts. Accordingly, I am pleased to lend my support to this measure and urge our colleagues to support it.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BARRETT).

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS). He asked me to name names. I said the institution. I think that this institution has an obligation to come out against racism. That is the name I name.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Watts resolution. This is just another example of the Republicans trying to have their cake and eat it too. On one hand, they claim to be against racism, but the Republican leadership refuses to condemn the Council of Conservative Citizens, or CCC, a modern-day KKK.

By killing a resolution condemning the racism and bigotry of the Council of Conservative Citizens, the Republican leadership denied itself the opportunity to attack the problem of racism.

House Resolution 35, of which I am an original cosponsor, has 142 cosponsors, including 13 Republicans, as well as the support of a broad base of civil rights leaders, religious organizations, and conservative activists. This has never been brought to the floor.

House Resolution 121, which was dropped last Friday, was rushed to the floor without even a single cosponsor and does not mention this terrible group. Fellows, if it looks like a duck, walks like a duck, and quacks like a duck, it is a duck.

By killing a resolution condemning "the racism and bigotry espoused by the Council of Conservative Citizens," the Republican leadership denied itself the opportunity to attack the problem of this new, more subtle kind of racism head on, the type sponsored by the Council of Conservative Citizens.

This is just another example of the Republicans trying to have their cake and eat it too. On one hand, they claim to be against racism and attack it, yet on the other, members of their leadership have ties to the CCC, which is in reality, a new form of the KKK. In fact, the CCC is an outgrowth of the abhorrent "White Citizens Council," which helped enforce segregation in the 1950s and 1960s. With ties to the Ku Klux Klan and other white supremacist groups, the CCC promotes a blatantly racist agenda, while masking its true ideology by acting as a mainstream conservative organization. Indeed, I say that if it looks like duck, quacks like a duck, and walks like a duck, it is in fact, a duck.

I believe that House Resolution 121, which is merely a watered down version of House Resolution 35, was brought to the floor in order to shield the Republican party from criticism for their relationship with the Council of Conservative Citizens. Indeed, while House Resolution 35, which has 142 cosponsors, including 13 Republicans, as well as the support of a broad base of civil rights leaders, religious organizations, and conservative activists, was never brought to the House Floor. This resolution, which was dropped just last Friday, was rushed to the Floor without even a single co-

sponsor. I believe this is a completely inauthentic resolution, and is being utilized purely as a political ploy to blunt criticism of certain members of the Republican party for their affiliation with the Conservative Council.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), chairman of the House Committee on Rules.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to join the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS) as a cosponsor of this important resolution condemning racism.

America was founded on the fundamental principle that God endowed each and every human being with an innate value and equality which stands above any man-made institution or authority.

This fundamental principle that human beings, with their rights and responsibilities, are the foundation upon which all good societies are built, is what has separated this great Nation from nearly every other civilization in history.

That said, we know human beings are flawed and that this country suffers from many of the same evils that we see tearing apart people and communities across the globe.

Racism divides us. Bigotry closes our minds and our hearts to others. Religious and ethnic intolerance eat away at our soul and reduce our humanity.

Therefore, we must repeat the message of racial and religious tolerance, not only to ourselves, but to our children who are the future.

We rise today unequivocally, not to state that our past is pure, not that we are without sin, not that we will not fail in the future, but that we will strive to live up to Abraham Lincoln's vision of America, "A nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

□ 1600

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 seconds to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER).

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Speaker, to clear the record the minority leader has not spoken to the Council of Conservative Citizens. His civil rights record is excellent and he is a sponsor of the resolution condemning the CCC.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE), the dedicated civil rights and constitutional expert on the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

I imagine that the people of the United States are wondering what happens here? What have we wrought, Mr. Speaker? What have we brought about? We have our good friends, the Republicans, debating that they are against

bigotry and racism, and I believe in their hearts and in their minds they are.

I had hoped, having visited the Gettysburg scene this past weekend, where the north and south rose up against each other, that we would come today on the floor of the House and join together as one voice against racism and bigotry, and that one voice is H.R. Resolution 35, the resolution by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) that specifically denounces the CCC.

I ask my colleagues, why can we not come together as one to recognize that racism and bigotry is wrong? In this instance it is one organization that has gone against Jews in anti-Semitism, denigrating American leaders like Abraham Lincoln and Martin Luther King. We lose today the spirit of unity and the reflection that the United States Congress stands as one by putting 121 over 35.

I ask the leadership to please bring us together and vote for H.R. 35. Bring it to the floor. We are not angry, we want to be one. The CCC should be denounced.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire of the Chair concerning the amount of time remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman Florida (Mr. CANADY) has 1½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) has 1 minute and 35 seconds remaining.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

My colleagues, it can now be perceived that this bill is a ruse; that it is totally characteristic of Republicans who want civil rights on the cheap in a futile attempt to show the country that they are really not Neanderthals. But when it comes to real substance, they attack civil rights laws at nearly every turn. We do not need meaningless words. We want action. But when it comes to real action, the Republican Congress turns its back.

When we try to raise the problem of civil rights laws being enforced, they respond by repealing key antidiscrimination laws.

We see the horrors of hate crimes every day. Jasper, Texas. James Byrd as an example. But we cannot move on hate crimes legislation.

We raise problems of police brutality, the spraying of 41 bullets into an unarmed black man. The tragic cases of Abner Louima and Mr. Diablo. We get no response from the committee that has jurisdiction. We could not even get funds for a hearing or a stenographer in Brooklyn, New York.

So we try to fully fund enforcement of civil rights laws at the Justice Department, but the Republican members of the Committee on the Judiciary

turn their backs on us. And now they ask us in good faith to support these words. We cannot do it, my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the rejection of H. Res. 121.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS).

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, again I repeat that hatred, expressed through racial, religious or ethnic prejudice, is an affront to the institutions of freedom, equal justice and individual rights that together form the bedrock of the American republic.

H. Res. 121 urges the House of Representatives to oppose all, A-L-L, all hate organizations, including the Council of Conservative Citizens and others. The New Order Knights of the Ku Klux Klan, the National Alliance, Aryan Nations, the National Association for the Advancement of White People, Knights of Freedom, and any other that would espouse the vile views that these organizations espouse needs to be rejected, and H. Res. 121 does that. I ask for its passage from my colleagues.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my colleagues, Congressmen WEXLER, CLYBURN, and FORBES and urge the Speaker to pull H. Res. 121, which simply affirms Congress' opposition to all forms of racism and bigotry, and substitute for it H. Res. 35, which condemns specific acts and expressions of racism by specific individuals and groups such as the Council of Conservative Citizens (CCC). H. Res. 35 deals with an important issue that affects all Americans, regardless of race, gender or sexual orientation. We must denounce racism and bigotry because it is dividing our country. We cannot tolerate narrow-mindedness from anyone or any group.

We must denounce racism and bigotry! The Red Shirts, the Knights of the White Camellia, the Ku Klux Klan, and the Council of Conservative Citizens are all groups aimed at preventing equal protection under the law for all Americans—and we must denounce them specifically for their actions and their rhetoric.

The Ku Klux Klan was formed in 1866 and it was a secret body that soon reached throughout the South and part of the North. Some people formed the Ku Klux Klan to stop newly freed slaves from exercising their rights as citizens pursuant to the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments to the Constitution.

We must denounce racism and bigotry! Traditionally, Klansmen, as they call themselves, were masked and dressed in white, and usually operated under a cover of darkness. But today, this group has traded its robe and hood for suits, ties and briefcases. They have traded their billboards for Internet websites, but we still know them because their rhetoric of hate remains the same.

Historically these groups have singled out all Negroes, Catholics, Jews, and foreigners that displease them by threats, whippings, setting fires or anything that will make their victim submit to the terroristic threats.

We must denounce racism and bigotry! This resolution will serve as notice that Congress

condemns racism and that it has no place in an orderly society. The Constitution of the United States guarantees every citizen the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. A prosperous American must develop a mutual respect and tolerance of diversity.

We must denounce racism and bigotry! America is a nation of migrants. A mosaic of different cultures and traditions, and that's why this is a great nation. We can no longer remain silent on this important issue. We can no longer ignore the fact that specific groups, like the CCC and the KKK, exist in this society and do nothing but foster hatred for humankind.

We must denounce racism and bigotry! Everyone must pull together to stamp out hate and bitterness. The Twenty-first century is upon us—all of Europe is unifying in a cooperative effort to work together for financial synergy, and we here still deal with groups unwilling to acknowledge that segregation has ended.

We must denounce racism and bigotry! We must become a testimony for and nation, under God with liberty and justice of all. We must come together as Americans to make the pledge of allegiance a reality for everyone.

We must denounce racism and bigotry! Racism has no place in America—we must begin to move beyond the color line—put aside our racial differences—move our country forward. Red, Yellow, Black, or White we are all precious in God's sight.

We must denounce racism and bigotry! It is essential that we vote NO on H. Res. 121 and I urge the House Leadership to schedule H. Res. 35 for a floor vote. Congress must take an active role through legislation and publicly state that acts of racism and bigotry are divisive tools that are utilized by small groups, including the CCC, to prevent unity and harmony amongst Americans.

We must denounce groups that organize simply to disseminate messages harmful to our society. Congress must act, in unison, not only to condemn racism and bigotry, but also to condemn acts of racism and bigotry. I urge each of you to vote to support H. Res. 35.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I will not waste time denouncing the CCC. This organization has already been exposed as the racist, hate-mongering, bigoted group that we all know it to be.

H. Res. 121 was brought before this body today as an attempt to "whitewash" real, meaningful legislation that will condemn a specific group for specific acts. It is not the altruistic piece of legislation Members on the other side of the aisle want you to think it is. To the contrary, it is a prime example that the CCC has been successful in achieving its goal of infiltrating the United States Congress.

All of a sudden, the reasons given by Republicans for their 1994 denunciation of Khalid Mohammed don't apply to this legislation. Even today, the Republicans have said it is acceptable to condemn the members of a Russian organization for making anti-Semitic statements, but they won't allow the House to take the same action against an American group that has attacked blacks, Latinos, immigrants, homosexuals, and Jews.

Republican actions warrant a specific question, "What is the problem with denouncing

the blatantly racist actions of an American group that has its roots planted in the cesspool of racial separatism and white supremacy?"

Maybe the answer to this question lies in statements made by Gordon Baum, the national CEO of the CCC. I think it explains why Republicans, especially Southern Republicans, refuse to distance themselves from this group:

When Jim Nicholson, RNC Chairman, asked Republicans to distance themselves from the group, Baum said, "He doesn't know what he is talking about."

Baum said that Nicholson is alienating key GOP voters: "The Wallace-Reagan Democrats are the ones who made the Republicans have enough votes to win. Without the Wallace-Reagan Democrats, the Republicans aren't going to have near the voting strength."

Baum contended Nicholson and other party leaders "are doing a pretty good job running them [white, working-class voters] off \* \* \* Sometimes it's remarkable how dumb they are. They let the liberal media run their campaigns. They apparently don't even know why these people vote Republican half the time."

Lott recently has renounced the group, and Baum warned that the majority leader could pay a political price in his home State. "It could be [there will be a backlash]. If he keeps it up, if he keeps distancing himself from everything. A sizable segment knows the truth, that we are very much in tune with the people of Mississippi on most issues."

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 121 is deceptive. It is a distraction, and it is doomed for failure. Once the Republicans finish trying to pass this farce of a bill off on the American public, I have a fence they can use the rest of their white wash on. That's about the only thing its good for.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 121.

The question was taken.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The postponed votes on the three earlier suspensions will be voted on following this vote. This will be a 15-minute vote followed by three 5-minute votes.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 254, nays 152, answered "present" 24, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 60]  
YEAS—254

Aderholt	Barrett (NE)	Berry
Archer	Bartlett	Biggert
Armey	Barton	Bilbray
Bachus	Bass	Bilirakis
Baker	Bateman	Bliley
Ballenger	Bereuter	Blunt
Barr	Berkley	Boehrlert

Boehner Hastings (WA)  
 Bonilla Hayes  
 Bono Hayworth  
 Boucher Hefley  
 Brady (TX) Herger  
 Bryant Hill (MT)  
 Burr Hilleary  
 Burton Hobson  
 Buyer Hoekstra  
 Callahan Holden  
 Calvert Hooley  
 Camp Horn  
 Campbell Hostettler  
 Canady Houghton  
 Cannon Hoyer  
 Cardin Hulshof  
 Castle Hunter  
 Chabot Hutchinson  
 Chambliss Hyde  
 Chenoweth Inslee  
 Coble Isakson  
 Coburn Istook  
 Collins Jenkins  
 Combest John  
 Cook Johnson (CT)  
 Cooksey Johnson, Sam  
 Costello Jones (NC)  
 Cox Kasich  
 Crane Kelly  
 Cubin King (NY)  
 Cunningham Kingston  
 Danner Knollenberg  
 Davis (VA) Kolbe  
 Deal Kuykendall  
 DeGette LaHood  
 DeLay Largent  
 DeMint Latham  
 Diaz-Balart LaTourette  
 Dickey Lazio  
 Doolittle Leach  
 Dreier Lewis (CA)  
 Duncan Lewis (KY)  
 Dunn Linder  
 Edwards LoBiondo  
 Ehlers Lucas (KY)  
 Ehrlich Lucas (OK)  
 English Manzullo  
 Everett McCollum  
 Ewing McCrery  
 Filner McHugh  
 Fletcher McInnis  
 Foley McIntosh  
 Fossella McIntyre  
 Fowler McKeon  
 Franks (NJ) McNulty  
 Frelinghuysen Metcalf  
 Gallegly Mica  
 Ganske Miller (FL)  
 Gekas Miller, Gary  
 Gibbons Moore  
 Gilchrest Moran (KS)  
 Gillmor Morella  
 Gilman Nethercutt  
 Goode Ney  
 Goodlatte Northup  
 Goodling Norwood  
 Gordon Nussle  
 Goss Ose  
 Graham Oxley  
 Granger Packard  
 Green (TX) Pascrell  
 Green (WI) Paul  
 Greenwood Pease  
 Gutknecht Peterson (PA)  
 Hall (OH) Petri  
 Hall (TX) Pickering  
 Hansen Pickett  
 Hastert Pitts

## NAYS—152

Abercrombie Borski  
 Ackerman Boswell  
 Allen Brady (PA)  
 Andrews Brown (CA)  
 Baird Brown (FL)  
 Baldacci Brown (OH)  
 Baldwin Capps  
 Barcia Capuano  
 Barrett (WI) Carson  
 Becerra Clay  
 Bentsen Clyburn  
 Berman Condit  
 Bishop Conyers  
 Blagojevich Coyne  
 Bonior Cummings

Davis (FL)  
 Davis (IL)  
 Delahunt  
 DeLauro  
 Deutsch  
 Dingell  
 Dixon  
 Doggett  
 Dooley  
 Doyle  
 Evans  
 Farr  
 Fattah  
 Ford  
 Frank (MA)

Frost  
 Gejdenson  
 Gephardt  
 Gonzalez  
 Gutierrez  
 Hastings (FL)  
 Hill (IN)  
 Hilliard  
 Hinchey  
 Hinojosa  
 Hoeffel  
 Holt  
 Jackson (IL)  
 Jackson-Lee  
 (TX)  
 Rothman  
 Jefferson  
 Johnson, E. B.  
 Jones (OH)  
 Kanjorski  
 Kaptur  
 Kennedy  
 Kildee  
 Kilpatrick  
 Kind (WI)  
 Kleczka  
 Kucinich  
 LaFalce  
 Lampson  
 Larson  
 Lee  
 Levin  
 Lewis (GA)  
 Lipinski  
 Luther  
 Maloney (CT)  
 Markey

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—24

Blumenauer Engel  
 Boyd Eshoo  
 Clayton Etheridge  
 Clement Forbes  
 Cramer Lofgren  
 Crowley Lowey  
 DeFazio Maloney (NY)  
 Dicks McCarthy (NY)

## NOT VOTING—4

Emerson Myrick  
 Lantos Stupak

□ 1630

Messrs. MOAKLEY, HINOJOSA, MALONEY of Connecticut, DINGELL, SANFORD and BARCIA changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. ROTHMAN, GREEN of Texas, SANDLIN, COSTELLO and McNULTY changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Ms. ESHOO and Messrs. BOYD, CRAMER and CROWLEY, and Ms. LOFGREN changed their vote from "yea" to "present."

Mr. NADLER, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. WISE and Mr. CLEMENT changed their vote from "nay" to "present."

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 60, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules.

Martinez  
 Mascara  
 Matsui  
 McCarthy (MO)  
 McDermott  
 McGovern  
 McKinney  
 Meehan  
 Meek (FL)  
 Meeks (NY)  
 Menendez  
 Millender-  
 McDonald  
 Miller, George  
 Minge  
 Mink  
 Moakley  
 Molohan  
 Moran (VA)  
 Murtha  
 Napolitano  
 Neal  
 Oberstar  
 Obey  
 Oliver  
 Ortiz  
 Owens  
 Pallone  
 Pastor  
 Payne  
 Pelosi  
 Peterson (MN)  
 Phelps  
 Pomeroy  
 Rahall  
 Rangel  
 Reyes

Rivers  
 Rodriguez  
 Roemer  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Rush  
 Sabo  
 Sanchez  
 Sanders  
 Sanford  
 Sawyer  
 Schakowsky  
 Serrano  
 Shows  
 Sisisky  
 Skelton  
 Spratt  
 Stark  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Thurman  
 Tierney  
 Towns  
 Udall (CO)  
 Udall (NM)  
 Velazquez  
 Vento  
 Visclosky  
 Waters  
 Waxman  
 Weiner  
 Wexler  
 Weygand  
 Woolsey  
 Wu  
 Wynn

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 70, by the yeas and nays;

H. Con. Res. 56, by the yeas and nays;

H. Con. Res. 37, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for each of these three votes.

## ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY BURIAL ELIGIBILITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 70.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 70, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 428, nays 2, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 61]

## YEAS—428

Abercrombie Burton  
 Ackerman Buyer  
 Aderholt Callahan  
 Allen Calvert  
 Andrews Camp  
 Archer Campbell  
 Armey Canady  
 Bachus Cannon  
 Baird Capps  
 Baker Capuano  
 Baldacci Cardin  
 Baldwin Carson  
 Ballenger Castle  
 Barcia Chabot  
 Barr Chambliss  
 Barrett (NE) Chenoweth  
 Barrett (WI) Clay  
 Bartlett Clayton  
 Barton Clement  
 Bass Clyburn  
 Bateman Coble  
 Becerra Coburn  
 Bentsen Collins  
 Bereuter Combest  
 Berkley Condit  
 Berman Conyers  
 Berry Cook  
 Biggert Cooksey  
 Bilbray Costello  
 Bilirakis Cox  
 Bishop Coyne  
 Blagojevich Cramer  
 Bliley Crane  
 Blumenauer Crowley  
 Blunt Cubin  
 Boehlert Cummings  
 Boehner Cunningham  
 Bonilla Danner  
 Bonior Davis (FL)  
 Bono Davis (IL)  
 Borski Davis (VA)  
 Boswell Deal  
 Boucher DeFazio  
 Boyd DeGette  
 Brady (PA) Delahunt  
 Brady (TX) DeLauro  
 Brown (CA) DeLay  
 Brown (FL) DeMint  
 Brown (OH) Deutsch  
 Bryant Diaz-Balart  
 Burr Dickey

Dicks  
 Dingell  
 Dixon  
 Doggett  
 Dooley  
 Doolittle  
 Doyle  
 Dreier  
 Duncan  
 Dunn  
 Edwards  
 Ehlers  
 Ehrlich  
 Engel  
 English  
 Eshoo  
 Etheridge  
 Evans  
 Everett  
 Ewing  
 Farr  
 Fattah  
 Fletcher  
 Foley  
 Forbes  
 Ford  
 Fossella  
 Fowler  
 Frank (MA)  
 Franks (NJ)  
 Frelinghuysen  
 Frost  
 Gallegly  
 Ganske  
 Gejdenson  
 Gekas  
 Gephardt  
 Gibbons  
 Gilchrest  
 Gillmor  
 Gilman  
 Gonzalez  
 Goode  
 Goodlatte  
 Goodling  
 Gordon  
 Goss  
 Graham  
 Granger  
 Green (TX)  
 Green (WI)